

Attorney docket OHG 144

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9 and 16 are requested to be amended. Claims 2, 10, and 17 are canceled.

[1-2] Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13, 16, 17, 21, and 23 were rejected under §103 over Park '259 in view of Tokuda '289 and Kato '764. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 2, 10 and 17 argued for below.

Advantages. The Applicant's semiconductor device uses a so-called WCSP manufacturing process such that the semiconductor chip and external terminals are directly connected without the use of an interposer such as a substrate, and the operational speed, functional sophistication, number of functions, and compactness of the semiconductor device can

PAGE 8/10 * RCVD AT 4/10/2006 6:52:48 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/18 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7174261664 * DURATION (mm-ss):22-14

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attorney docket OHG 144

The Applicant's previous arguments are reiterated and incorporated by reference. For example, the Applicant argued before that Tokuda's chip 10 rests on a die-attached film 30 which is "adhesive" (col. 10, line 41) and therefore not silicon. The substrate 20, on which the film 30 rests, is made of polyimide (col. 10, line 54) and Tokuda gives reasons why this is a preferred material, so there is no teaching toward using another material, such as silicon. Thus, Takuda teaches against the silicon which asserted to be taught by Kato.

The Applicant also argued that Yamaguchi does not actually disclose the claimed subject matter.

Withdrawal of the objections and rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Bromer

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

April 10, 2006